MANY BAD VOTES

THE LEGISLATIVE RECORD

OF

J P. Whitney, M.P.P.

A Non-progressive and Reactionary Public Man.

Mr. Whitney's Legislative record has been one of unreasonable opposition to everything proposed by the Liberal Government. He has opposed many of the best legislative features of the Government, which have since been sanctioned by public opinion. He has initiated nothing. He has proposed nothing new. According to the "*Ontario Tory*," a monthly journal issued in the interests of the Conservative party, Mr. Whitney has no constructive policy and is a man of small ideas. The following extracts from his legislative record will prove the truth of the above statements and show how ill-fitted he is to become Premier of this great Province of Ontario.

Opposed the Early Closing of Shops.

By reference to page 137, Journals of 1888, it will be noticed that on the third reading of the Government Bill "to regulate the closing of shops and hours of labor therein," Mr. Whitney entered his vote against it.

Opposed the Appointment of a Minister of Agriculture.

During the session of 1888 a Government Bill was brought in "respecting the Department of Agriculture and other industries." It was moved by Mr. Meredith, seconded by Mr. Creighton, that "while this House concurs in the proposition to give greater attention by the Executive Government to the agricultural interests of the Province than has hitherto been done, it is of opinion that that end can be attained without incurring the expense of adding another member to the Executive Council, and the inevitable additional expense

1902 (?)

which will be consequent on such addition, and that therefore the said bill be not now read the third time, but be forthwith referred back to the Committee of the Whole House, with instructions to amend the same by striking out the third section thereof." (Page 136, Journals)

The section of the bill which it was proposed to strike out reads as follows :—"The Act respecting the Executive Council is further amended so far as the same restricts the Executive Council to six members."

Had Mr Meredith's resolution prevailed there could not have been a Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Whitney voted for this amendment and by doing so opposed the appointment of a Minister of Agriculture. By this vote he clearly put himself on record in opposition to one of the most important and most beneficial moves the Government ever made.

Wanted to abolish the Office of Minister of Education.

Mr. Whitney voted for the abolition of the office of Minister of Education in the following amendment, moved by Mr. White, seconded by Mr. Clancy, on April 30th, 1891 (p. 163 Jls.): "That the said bill (consolidating and revising laws respecting the Education Department) be not now read the third time, but that it be resolved that it is expedient to place the Education Department under the control of a non-political head and that the bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House with instructions to amend the same by providing for the abolition of the office of Minister of Education after the dissolution of the present House." Mr. Whitney was, therefore, then and is now in favor of an irresponsible oligarchy to control our educational interests, instead of the present system of Governmental responsibility. Again in 1894 (p. 148, Jls.) Mr. Whitney voted for a similar amendment.

Opposed the Appointment of a Drainage Referee.

During the session of 1391 a Bill was introduced by the Government "respecting disputes under the drainage laws," and providing for the appointment of an expert drainage referee. Mr. Whitney opposed this under an amendment introduced by Mr. Meredith (p. 173, Journals). Mr. Whitney also repeated his vote on March 29th, 1899.

Opposed the Appointment of Superintendent of Neglected Children

Mr. Whitney opposed the appointment of a Superintenent of Neglected Children— a branch that has fully justified its establishment and existence. Mr. Meredith moved an amendment to the bill "for the prevention of cruelty to and the better protection of children" and Mr. Whitney joined with the Opposition in voting against it, (p. 150, Journals).

0 900547

Voted against much needed Accommodation for the Insane in Eastern Ontario.

On April 12th, 1892, (p. 199, Journals) Mr. Whitney voted against a resolution respecting a new Asylum for the Insane for Eastern Ontario, afterwards located at Brockville, although it was soon filled with patients, showing the wisdom of increasing the accommodation for the insane at that time.

Unreasonably Opposed to the Ontario Agricultural College.

Mr. Whitney's attitude towards the Guelph Agricultural College has never been one of blind and unreasonable opposition, though the value of the establishment has been again and again proved by the farming community. On page 196 of the Journals of 1893 it is recorded that Mr. Marter moved, seconded by Mr. Kerns, " that the resolution respecting grant (in aid of agriculture) be not concurred in, but be forthwith referred back to a Committee of the Whole House, with instructions to strike out the proposed vote of $1,500 for the salary of an assistant in the Department of Natural History, Librarian, etc. for the Ontario Agricultural College." Mr. Whitney voted for this motion, and in so doing evidenced his antagonism to this most useful and well conducted institution.

Voted against a Plebiscite on the Temperance Question.

On May 2nd, 1893, (p. 98, Journals) a vote was taken on a resolution of the Government to take a plebiscite on the temperance question. Mr. Whitney recorded his vote against this method of ascertaining public opinion on the subject referred to.

THE EXPORT OF SAW-LOGS.

In the Session of 1893, the question of inserting the condition in future sales that timber cut on Crown lands shall be sawn in Canada, was raised in a motion by Mr. Miscampbell, M.P.P. for East Simcoe. The motion was made in Committee of Supply, and so could not be amended :—

" That all the words after ' That ' be struck out and the following substituted : ' This House disapproves of the policy of disposing of the timber reserves of the Province without its approval being first obtained, and is of opinion that the right to cut timber upon the present reserves should be sold under such conditions as will ensure the manufacture of the lumber cut therefrom within the Province, and more effectually guard against the unnecessary cutting and destruction of small timber growing in such reserves.' "

It might appear that this was the first move in the matter, but here again the Government were the first to take such a step. In the fall of 1890, the Government had a timber sale and inserted the condition, for the first time, requiring the logs to be sawn in Canada.

Then came the Ontario timber sale of 1892. In the meantime an agreement had been made between the Dominion Government and the United States, under which our trade in sawn lumber had expanded and had become more profitable; should that position be disturbed and the whole question re-opened? The Government, therefore, concluded not to re-open so large a question for such a small and doubtful benefit, and did not insert the condition. The sale was held, and although an increase of 25 per cent. was made in the timber dues, the largest prices ever obtained were paid as bonus, and out of 633 miles sold only 78 miles went to Americans, and from these 78 miles down to this day not one log has been cut for exportation. One Canadian who purchased a four-mile limit has sold five millions of feet for export, and this is the entire quantity which has gone out of territory included in the timber sale of 1892. The Government pursued the wise course on that occasion.

It will be seen that Mr. Miscampbell's motion dealt with two distinct questions. It condemned the sale of timber lands without a previous vote of the Legislature, and it proposed that, in future sales, the condition of manufacture in the Province of Ontario should be inserted. It mixed up two matters which had nothing to do with each other. Fires frequently occur which render prompt sale of the damaged timber necessary, otherwise it goes to waste, as the boring insects get into it. If this motion had passed, such timber could not be sold until the House met and a vote was taken. There were other strong reasons why the discretion should remain with the Government. The manufacturing condition was to be a narrower one than was ever proposed or thought of before. It was to oblige the timber to be manufactured in the Province, so that Quebec mill-owners, who might buy logs from Ontario limits, would be unable to do so any longer, unless their mills were moved into the Province of Ontario. It was discrimination against the lumbermen of a sister province. Of course, such a motion, which, owing to the time and manner of its introduction, could not be amended, did not commend itself to the House, and so was voted down by a majority of 21.

In 1894 the matter again became an issue, and the policy of the Government up to that point was approved by their return at the general election of that year.

Following this the United States Congress conceded free lumber for free logs until the hostile Dingley Bill and its successive protectionism led the Ontario Government to pass the Act of 1897-8, providing for the insertion of the manufacturing conditions in all future licenses, and making the crown timber regulations conform thereto.

It will thus be seen that the Government took the initial steps regarding the manufacture of logs in the country three years before the belated and contradictory motion of the opposition, (and which was the only made for political purposes on the eve of a general election), and have since continued to deal with the important question promptly and effectually as circumstances called for.

A later development was the submission, by consent, of the constitutionality of the Act of 1897-8 to a Trial Court, at the instance of some of the Michigan lumbermen interested. Argument was made before Mr. Justice Street, who gave judgment on Nov. 24, 1899, in favor of the Province on every point in dispute, thus forming another great victory in the courts for Provincial Rights.

Opposed to a Survey of Our New Territory.

Mr. Whitney is on record as voting against the yearly surveys of new townships in Northern Ontario—surveys that were absolutely needed as settlement advanced. On May 26th, 1893, Mr. Clancy moved, seconded by Mr. Miscampbell, "that a resolution (respecting the expense of the Crown Lands Department) be not now concurred in, but be forthwith referred back to a Committee of the Whole House with insiructions to strike out the item of $35,000 proposed to be voted for surveys of townships in new districts." (See p. 197, Journals, 1893.)

Opposed Appointment of Clerk of Forestry.

Almost every new departure by the Government, which the country has again and again approved, was voted against by Mr. Whitney. On April 30th, 1894, Mr. Meek moved, seconded by Mr. Preston, "that the resolution respecting grants (in aid of agriculture) be not now concurred in, but be forthwith recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House with instructions to reduce the item by $2,000, being the salary and disbursements of the Clerk of Forestery, which office was now vacant and in the opinion of this House should be discontinued." (See p. 179, Journals, 1894.)

Mr. Whitney joined with the opposition in voting for this resolution, and yet no branch of Government was more needed or has proved itself more valuable than the Forestry Branch of the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Whitney has never grasped the importance of the great subject of forest preservation and reforestry.

On March 29th, 1899, for the third time Mr. Whitney voted to abolish the office of Clerk of Forestry.

Opposed School for Training of Teachers.

A vote was taken in the House on April 3[illegible]94 (P. 179, Jls.) to grant a certain sum for the Ontario Scho[illegible]. Mr. Whitney opposed the grant and voted against it.

Opposed to Good Roads.

True to his old-fashioned and non-progressive ideas Mr. Whitney, during the session of 1896, voted for the following resolution, which was moved by Mr. Meacham and seconded by Mr. Magwood: "that all the words of the motion after the word 'that' be struck out and the following substituted—'this House views with alarm the tendency of the Government to create new offices and is of the opinion that the office of Provincial Highway Commissioner with a salary of $1,500, exclusive of expenses, is unnecessary, and places an additional and useless burden on the Province.'" (See p. 185, Journals.)

The creation of a new office of Provincial Road Commissioner has been more than justified by the subsequent experience, and the Government has received more praise for their advanced policy in this than almost any other one act. And yet, as had been said, Mr. Whitney did all in his power to block progress in this direction.

Voted against the County Council Bill.

The public will recall the excellent and much needed legislation of 1896 to reduce the number of county councillors, thus effecting a great saving in time and expense in this form of municipal government, besides simplifying the election and procedure. Mr. Whitney moved a six months' hoist of the bill, thus opposing another legislative reform demanded and since sanctioned by the people (p. 166, Journals.)

Opposed to the proper Audit of Municipal Accounts.

On April 9th, 1897, on a resolution in Committee of Supply to vote $2,100 for the purpose of a Municipal Auditor's salary and expenses, Mr. Whitney voted against it. The published reports of this officer are the best evidence of the need of such appointment, which has saved municipalities thousands of dollars and effected a much needed reform.

Voted against the encouragement of Poultry Raising.

Page 152 of Journals, 1897, records the following motion: "Mr Carnegie moved, seconded by Mr. Kidd, that the resolution (respecting grants in aid of agriculture) be not now concurred in, but be forthwith referred back to the Committee of Supply with instructions to reduce the item by $2,000 for the farm proper of the Agricultural College and $1,400 for the Poultry Association." Mr. Whitney's name is among the supporters of this motion, which is indicative of his attitude and that of his party toward agricultural interests.

Opposed School for Training of Public School Teachers.

While in Committee of Supply in the House on March 30th, 1899, (p. 287, Jls), an amendment was supported by Mr. Whitney to do

away with a proposed grant of $22,000 to the new Normal School at London.

More Opposition to Agricultural Interests.

The Journals of the House of 1899 (page 264) show that Mr. Carnegie moved, seconded by Mr. Little, "that the resolution (respecting grants in aid of agriculture) be not now concurred in, but be forthwith referred back to the Committee of Supply with instructions to reduce the item by $8,100, being $2,500 voted for instructions in fruit spraying, $1,000 Pioneer Dairy Farm and $2,600 Western Dairy School, and $2,000 reduction in vote for printing." Here again Mr. Whitney proved himself to be an obstructionist in much that pertains to the development of our agricultural interests.

Again, on April 26th, 1900, Mr. Whitney voted for Mr. Carnegie's motion to strike out of the estimates the sum of $2,600 for the Western Dairy School at Strathroy.

Mr. Whitney talks of establishing three or four Agricultural Colleges in Ontario; still, he has voted for the abolition, practically, of a Dairy School which costs the Province a trifle and which has been the means of giving instruction in butter and cheese making to a large number of people.

The Public Works Department Also! Wanted to Wipe it Out.

As late as the session of 1899 Mr. Whitney voted to do away with the Public Works Department, thus wiping out of existence this important branch of Government, which for 25 years has been under the control of a Catholic Minister of the Crown. On March 29th, 1899, (p. 249 Journals) a resolution of the Committee of Supply was opposed by an Opposition amendment, which read, "that the resolution be not now concurred in, but be forthwith referred back to the Committee of Supply, with instructions to reduce the item by $18,750 being the salary and expenses of the Public Works Department."

Voted Against Immigration.

By reference to page 262 of the Journals of 1899 it will be seen that the Leader of the Opposition supported a Conservative amendment "that the resolution respecting immigration be not now concurred in, but be forthwith referred back to the Committee of Supply with instructions to reduce the item by $4,825, being immigration vote for agencies in Europe."

Voted Against the Victorian Order of Nurses.

The Government brought in a resolution on March 29, 1899, voting $2,500 for Lady Aberdeen's Victorian Order of Nurses (p. 259 Jour-

nals.) Strange to say Mr. Whitney voted against this small vote for such a deserving philanthropy.

Opposed the Opening up of New Ontario.

Notwithstanding the fact that the electors have clearly evinced a wish that the opening up of New Ontario should be facilitated, Mr. Whitney opposed the important Railway Bill of 1899, by personally moving several detailed amendments, although he refrained from voting on the bill as a whole. It will be remembered that the railway resolutions of 1899 provided for assistance to railways that would tap Moose River on James Bay, and that would bring within reach the Lake Abittibi region and the country lying west of Lake Temiscaming. It also provided for assistance to the Ontario and Rainy River Railway. Mr. Whitney, however, did all in his power to negative this assistance on the part of the Province.

Opposed the Encouragement of British Immigration.

On April 26th, 1900, Mr. Whitney voted to strike out of the Estimates the sum of $4,825, being the amount expended for maintaining an Emigration Office at Liverpool. This was done, notwithstanding the fact that what Ontario wants most at the present moment is the encouragement of farm laborers and settlers on her wild lands.

Another Vote Against the Development of New Ontario.

On April 27th, 1900, Mr. Whitney voted against the third reading of the Bill providing a land grant to the Algoma Central Railway. Mr Whitney characterized this land grant as a "phenomenal steal," although he afterwards practically apologized for his vote at a meeting held in the Victoria Hall, September, 1901, in the City of Toronto.

Opposed the Development of the Pulp Industries of the Province.

Mr. Whitney voted against all the arguments submitted by the Government in the session of 1900 for developing the pulp industries of the country. For instance, he voted against a grant to the Nepigon Pulp and Paper Manufacturing Company. On the same day, he voted against a grant to the Blanche River Pulp and Paper Company. On the 10th April, he voted against a grant to the Spanish River Pulp and Paper Company. If Mr. Whitney had his own way, no progress would have been made in the development of the pulp industries of the country, which are promoting settlement and which have already given employment to a great number of people, and in the course of a few years will form the nucleus of small towns in northern Ontario.

ll vote for

ly evinced
itated, Mr.
personally
from vot-
he railway
would tap
reach the
Temiscam-
iny River
gative this

on.

the Esti-
aintaining
hstanding
ent is the
ds.

rio.

ird read-
Railway.
al steal,"
meeting
onto.

rovince.

l by the
ndustries
Nepigon
he voted
ny. On
er Pulp
progress
stries of
already
rse of a
Ontario.